

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/839,342	04/20/2001	Joseph I. Kravitz	E14.2-9321	1879		
490	7590 10/24/2003		EXAMINER			
	RRETT & STEINKRAU CIRCLE DRIVE	MARKOFF, ALEXANDER				
SUITE 2000		ART UNIT PAPER NUM				
MINNETONKA, MN 55343-9185			1746			
			DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

ue a						/ /i	
			Application No.	\bigcup	Applicant(s)	1/1	
Advisory Action		09/839,342		KRAVITZ ET AL.			
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			Examiner		Art Unit	T - !	
·			Alexander Markoff		1746		
The MAILING DATE of	this communic	ation appe	ears on the cover sheet w	vith the c	orrespondence add	iress	
THE REPLY FILED 13 October Therefore, further action by the final rejection under 37 CFR 1.1 condition for allowance; (2) a timexamination (RCE) in compliance	applicant is req 13 may <u>only</u> be nely filed Notice	uired to avection either: (1) of Appea	oid abandonment of this) a timely filed amendme	s applica ent whicl	ation. A proper rep	ly to a ation in	∍d
	<u>PERIOI</u>	O FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or	b)]			
no event, however, will the s ONLY CHECK THIS BOX W 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtaine fee have been filed is the date for purpo fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated	on: (1) the mailing of tatutory period for a HEN THE FIRST for under 37 CFR 1. ses of determining from: (1) the expira	date of this A reply expire I REPLY WAS 136(a). The the period of tion date of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date atter than SIX MONTHS from FILED WITHIN TWO MONT date on which the petition unif extension and the corresporthe shortened statutory period	the mailing THS OF TH der 37 CF Inding amo d for reply	g date of the final reject HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the app unt of the fee. The app originally set in the fina.	tion. See MPE ropriate ex propriate ex I Office act	EP ktension xtension tion; or
(2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. imely filed, may reduce any earned pate	ent term adjustmer	nt. See 37 C	FR 1.704(b).			ction, eve	n If
1. A Notice of Appeal was fil 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any e							
2. The proposed amendmen	t(s) will not be	entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues	s that would req	uire furthe	er consideration and/or s	search (s	see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of	f new matter (s	ee Note b	elow);				
(c) they are not deemed issues for appeal; and		plication ir	n better form for appeal	by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying	; the
(d) ☐ they present addition NOTE:	nal claims witho	ut canceli	ng a corresponding num	nber of fi	nally rejected claim	IS.	
3. Applicant's reply has over	come the follow	ving reject	ion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amend canceling the non-allowal	led claim(s)		· · · ——	d in a se	parate, timely filed	amendr	nent
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) end application in condition fo				en consi	dered but does NO	T place	the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will raised by the Examiner in			ause it is not directed S0	OLELY to	o issues which wer	e newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the explanation of how the ne						and an	
The status of the claim(s)	is (or will be) as	s follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: none.							
Claim(s) objected to: none	<u>2</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: 21-27.			•				
Claim(s) withdrawn from	consideration: <u>1</u>	1- <u>20</u> and 28	<u>3-31</u> .				
8. The proposed drawing cor	rection filed on	is	a) approved or b)	disapp	roved by the Exam	iner.	
9. Note the attached Informa	tion Disclosure	Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)			1
0. Other:					v) 2	111	4
·			R MARKOFF	Alo	147		
		PHIMARY	EXAMINER		Alexander Markoff Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1746	:	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)



 \bigcirc

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Upon consideration of the applicant's arguments presented in Remarks filed in response to the previous Office action, the examiner has not found the applicant's arguments persuasive. The rejections made by examiner Carrillo are maintained for the reasons of the record. The examiner's position is that the applicant's arguments are more specific than the instant claims and that the prior art reads on the instant claims.